



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Handwritten signature]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,580	01/18/2005	Tomonori Fujisawa	IPA-005	4028

32628 7590 07/09/2007
KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP
1700 DIAGONAL RD
SUITE 310
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848

EXAMINER

RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2109

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,580	Applicant(s) FUJISAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason Recek	Art Unit 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>18 January 2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the application filed on January 18th 2005, in which claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claim 1-8 are currently pending, of which claim 1 is in independent form.

Claims 1 and 4 are currently objected to.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(a).

Claims 3 and 5-8 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the acronym "URL" is not spelled out. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "response column" lack antecedent basis. Also the phrase "response column transmitted each of the terminal devices" is unclear, if the terminal devices are transmitting the response column that can be indicated with the phrase 'response column transmitted *by* each of the terminal devices. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Orime et al. JP 2002-183365 A (hereinafter Orime).

Regarding claim 1, Orime discloses “a service server” as WWW server (paragraph 21, Fig. 9), “terminal devices owned by said informing person and said informed persons connected to each other via a computer network” as an information network connecting two parties (paragraph 21, Fig. 9), and “server transmits informing E-mails each including a URL” as prospective clients receiving e-mail with URL (paragraph 31).

Regarding claim 2, Orime discloses “wherein said URL has a document described with a www-compatible language” as a URL that when inputted into a Web browser will access the sever (paragraph 31), and “including a response column” as a webpage which the user can indicate if participating (paragraphs 31-32).

Regarding claim 4, Orime discloses “wherein said service server detects data concerning said response column transmitted each of the terminal devices owned by

Art Unit: 2109

said informed persons, and transmits a result of detection as a reporting E-mail to the terminal device owned by said informing person" as a system that sends an e-mail to the manager before the event regarding the status of the event based upon the user's responses (paragraph 33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Bickmore et al. JP 2000-222398 A (hereinafter Bickmore).

Regarding claim 3, Orime does not disclose "wherein said document [...] has been processed for screen partition for various display capacities of terminal devices" however Bickmore teaches this as a re-authoring system for transforming a document into two or more sub documents for viewing on PDAs (paragraphs 8-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Orime with Bickmore. The motivation is to ensure that the WWW documents can be properly read on PDAs thus allowing the user to see the messages without connecting using a full size personal computer.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Hasebe JP 2000-207300 A (hereinafter Hasebe).

Regarding claim 5, Orime does not disclose "wherein said reporting E-mail includes a plurality of choices for re-informing methods" however Hasebe teaches this as a Web browser which displays information and gives a plurality of choices which at a minimum include deciding whether or not to resend the email (paragraphs 37-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Orime with Hasebe. The motivation is to allow the organizer to retry the users who have not confirmed.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Makita JP 2000-231527 A (hereinafter Makita).

Regarding claim 6, Orime does not disclose "said reporting E-mail includes a URL for linking to said result of detection" and "the URL has a document described with www-compatible language and including the result of detection" however these are taught by Makita. Makita discloses a system that sends an email linking a website that

Art Unit: 2109

contains the results of user's answers similar to the results received for the invention of Orime (paragraph 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Orime with Makita. The motivation is to make it easier for the manager to view the results.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Makita and in further view of Hasebe.

Regarding claim 7, neither Orime nor Makita disclose "wherein said document [...] includes a plurality of choices for re-informing methods" however Hasebe teaches this as a Web browser which displays information and gives a plurality of choices which at a minimum include deciding whether or not to resend the email (paragraphs 37-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Orime and Makita with Hasebe. The motivation is to allow the organizer to retry the users who have not confirmed.

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Makita and in further view of Bickmore.

Regarding claim 8, neither Orime nor Makita disclose "wherein said document [...] has been subjected to a screen partition processing to accommodate various display capacities of the terminal device" however Bickmore teaches this as a re-authoring system for transforming a document into two or more sub documents for viewing on PDAs (paragraphs 8-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Orime and Makita with Bickmore. The motivation is to ensure that the WWW documents can be properly read on PDAs thus allowing the user to see the messages without connecting using a full size personal computer.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hanson et al. U.S. Pat. 6,457,045 B1 discloses an interactive user invitation system.

Ordille et al. US2003/0217109 A1 discloses a notification and response system with URL embedded emails.

Dennis US2007/0050462 A1 discloses accessing electronic files from email.

Henneuse et al. U.S. Pat. 5,963,913 discloses an event scheduling system.

Art Unit: 2109

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Recek whose telephone number is (571) 270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jason Recek
6/26/07


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER